

Remarks/Arguments

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmerman (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0093789), in view of Vanderable (U.S. Patent No. 6,204,761).

It is respectfully asserted that neither of Zimmerman nor Vanderable, alone or in combination, disclose:

“a processor operative to automatically enable a network connection, responsive to said emergency alert signals, to a source of information related to the emergency alert function and retrieve updated information related to the reception or processing of said emergency alert signals included on a tuned frequency by said emergency alert function,”

as described in claim 1.

Zimmerman teaches a system “for monitoring broadcast content and generating notification signals as a function of subscriber profiles and methods of operating the same. According to an exemplary embodiment, a monitoring system is introduced that is capable of identifying special event content within a plurality of broadcast content streams, each of the plurality of broadcast content streams having detectable content attributes. The monitoring system is operable to (i) sense a content change within at least one of the plurality of broadcast content streams as a function of the detectable content attributes, (ii) detect the special event content broadcast within the at least one of the plurality of broadcast content streams as a function of the sensed content change, and (iii) selectively generate a notification signal as a function of the detected special event content and a subscriber profile.” (Zimmerman Abstract)

As admitted in the Office Action, “Zimmerman fails to disclose a processor operative to automatically enable a network connection, responsive to said emergency alert signals, to a source of information related to the emergency alert function and retrieve

updated information related to the emergency alert signals included on a tuned frequency by said emergency alert function.” Similarly, Zimmerman fails to disclose retrieving such updated emergency alert information over a network connection. Thus, Zimmerman fails to disclose “a processor operative to automatically enable a network connection, responsive to said emergency alert signals, to a source of information related to the emergency alert function and retrieve updated information related to the reception or processing of said emergency alert signals included on a tuned frequency by said emergency alert function,” as described in claim 1.

Vanderable teaches a “weather alert system to warn a user when an emergency signal has been broadcast and to simultaneously activate a television or other visual information source and to select a predetermined informational channel. The weather alert system includes a signal detector for detecting a broadcast alarm signal and for generating an activation signal upon detection of the alarm signal. A remote controller is operatively connected to the signal detector for producing a remote control signal in response to said activation signal. The remote control signal is utilized to trigger the activation of a visual information source such as a television or a computer to provide visual information relating to the hazardous condition.” (Vanderable Abstract)

Vanderable describes a system that includes “a receiver 12 for receiving signals indicative of a hazardous condition, a signal detector... and a remote controller 22 for activating a visual information source 26 such as a television to a preselected informational channel.” (Vanderable, column 3, lines 21-35) Vanderable also describes an embodiment in which the receiver “may instead include an interface 40 adapted to receive a signal from a hardwired digital or analog communications network 24 such as a telephone network, a computer wide area network or a direct Internet connection.” (Vanderable, column 3, lines 56-60)

Nowhere, however, does Vanderable describe enabling a network connection responsive to reception of alert signals or describe retrieving updated information from such a connection. Vanderable discloses various possibilities for how a signal may be received (i.e., RF receiver, or network), but does not describe initiation of a connection in response

to reception of a signal on a tuned frequency. Vanderable simply turns on a television and set it to a particular channel in response to the signals. If a network connection is used in Vanderable, it would have already been established to allow receipt of an alert, not enabled in response to receipt of the alert. Thus, Vanderable, like Zimmerman, fails to disclose “a processor operative to automatically enable a network connection, responsive to said emergency alert signals, to a source of information related to the emergency alert function and retrieve updated information related to the reception or processing of said emergency alert signals included on a tuned frequency by said emergency alert function,” as described in claim 1.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure provided by Zimmerman or Vanderable, alone or in combination, that makes the present invention as claimed in claim 1 unpatentable. It is also respectfully submitted that independent claims 11 and 21 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Since dependent claims 2-10, 12-20, and 22-30 are dependent from allowable independent claims 1, 11, and 21, it is submitted that they too are allowable for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner’s rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant’s representative at (609) 734-6804, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Scott A. Kendall

/Brian J. Cromarty/

By: Brian J. Cromarty
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 64018
Phone (609) 734-6804

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
July 16, 2010